

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 149 and 151-153 are now pending, wherein claims 149, 151 and 152 are amended and claim 150 is canceled and claims are new.

Claims 149-153 are rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the combination of WO 99/12108 to Davies et al. ("Davies") and U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548 to Burner et al. ("Burner"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 149 is amended to incorporate some of the elements of canceled claim 150. Accordingly, claim 149 now recites first and second save options that are presented to a user within a window of a browser client. In the method of claim 149 web page data browsed by the browser client is acquired:

1. when the selection of the ***first*** save option is received; and
2. when the client newly browses the web page data if the selection of the ***second*** save option is received.

Additionally, claim 149 also requires that the acquired web page data is saved:

1. without prompting the user for a file name or destination folder when the selection of the ***first*** save option is received from the user; and
2. without any further instruction from the user when the browser client is subsequently operated to move to another URL, if the selection of the ***second*** save option has been received from the user.

The combination of Davies and Burner does not disclose or suggest a method that involves the claimed first and second save options.

Davies discloses techniques for identifying keywords in web page data sets. In particular, Davies allows a user to transmit a store command to a Jasper agent 105, which then allows the user to supply an associated annotation that is stored along with the web page in an intelligent page store (IPS) 100. Davies, however, does not disclose or suggest a first and second save option. Additionally, the saving in Davies does not involve acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client when the selection of the *first* save option is received and then saving the web page data without prompting the user for a file name or destination folder when the selection of the *first* save option is received from the user.

Moreover Davies does not disclose or suggest that when the second save option is received from a user web page data browsed by the browser client is acquired *when the client newly browses* the web page data and the acquired web page data is saved without any further instruction from the user *when the browser client is subsequently operated to move to another URL*.

Bruner is directed to a technique for automatically generating and displaying metadata as supplemental information concurrent with a web page. The system of Bruner includes a database 111 that contains an archive of the contents of web sites. The web sites in this database, however, are not saved based on save options presented to a user. Instead, the web sites are acquired in an automated manner using a web crawler.¹ The system of Bruner also allows a user to save a link to a web page.² The saving of a link, however, does not

¹ See, for example, column 5, lines 48-60.

² See, for example, Figures 11 and 12(a)-(d).

involve acquiring and saving web page data in the manner required by the claimed first and second save options. Accordingly, Bruner, like Davies, does not disclose or suggest the claimed first and second save options.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Davies and Bruner, the combination would at best involve allowing a user to save a web page using Davies' Jasper agent 105 and saving links using the system of Bruner. The combination would not, however, involve:

1. acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client and then saving the web page data without prompting the user for a file name or destination folder when the selection of the *first* save option is received from the user; and
2. acquiring the web page data by the browser client *when the client newly browses* the web page data and saving the acquired web page data without any further instruction from the user *when the browser client is subsequently operated to move to another URL* when the second save option is received.

Accordingly, the combination of Davies and Bruner does not render claim 149 obvious. Claims 151-153 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Davies and Bruner at least by virtue of their dependency. Thus, the rejection of claims 149-153 for obviousness should be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit
Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 103251.58983US.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2010

/Stephen W. Palan, Reg. # 43,420/
Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
SWP:crr
11545582